UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/567,165 | 07/17/2008 | Kazuhiko Terashima | 04632.0067 | 4580 | |
| 22852 7590 12/15/2009 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER | | | EXAMINER | | |
| LLP | ŕ | NOLAN, PETER D | | | |
| 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3661 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 12/15/2009 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/567,165 | TERASHIMA ET AL. | | |
| | | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | Peter D. Nolan | 3661 | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>24 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of the control of the corresponding amount of the control of the corresponding amount of the corresponding | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second co | sideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially red | ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov | See Continuation Sheet. Dowable if submitted in a separate, to will not be entered, or b) will | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-7. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | before or on the date of filing a No | otice of Appeal will not | be entered | | | |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| /Thomas G. Black/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3661 | /Peter D Nolan/ Examiner, Art Unit 3661 | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections of claims 1-4, 7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1-3, Feddema (US 5785191) teaches where the parameters of the filter take into account effects of the performance of the crane unit such as acceleration or velocity of the crane (see Feddema column 13, line 44 thru column 14, line 8. Regarding claims 4-7, Robinett (US 6442439 B1) teaches where the effects of the performance of the crane unit such as luff and slew rates (see Robinett column 6, lines 36-44). Therefore, applicant's arguments regarding Feddema and Robinett are non-persuasive.